



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/837,844	04/18/2001	Adrian Yap	PD-200297	3966

7590                    08/20/2007  
Hughes Electronics Corporation  
Patent Docket Administration  
Bldg. 1, Mail Stop A109  
P.O. Box 956  
El Segundo, CA 90245-0956

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

RAMAN, USHA

[REDACTED] ART UNIT      [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2623

[REDACTED] MAIL DATE      [REDACTED] DELIVERY MODE

08/20/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/837,844	YAP ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Usha Raman	2623

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 7-23-07 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
Please see attached 'Response to Arguments'.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

CHRIS KELLEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed July 23<sup>rd</sup> 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments (see Remarks, page 20-21) stating that, "the Office action uses only the newly cited art when providing alleged support for rejecting the recitation 'tracking a list of recorded programs for duplicate when a record operation is initiated, and activating a preference to erase a recording of a program that is identified as a duplicate'" and therefore, "the finality of the rejection is premature" because, "claim 1 was amended to include recitations of dependent claims of 6 and 12 and thus recites the original scope of claim 12" have been noted. However the examiner disagrees with applicant's position. Claim 12, originally recited, "activating an automatic preference to erase any recording of a program that is identified as a duplicate". Claim 1, as submitted on January 29<sup>th</sup> 2007 recites, "activating a preference to erase a recording of a program that is identified as a duplicate". Claim 1 therefore presents a broader scope by no longer requiring an automatic preference for erasing duplicate programs, which changes the scope of search performed by the Office. Accordingly the search conducted by the Office and the consequent evidence presented is justified by the presented amendments and the finality of the rejection is deemed appropriate.

Applicant also traverses (see Remarks, page 22-24) the combination of Liebenow and Browne stating that, "Liebenow fails to describe or suggest that duplicates are unnecessary data" and that, "Browne does not indicate that these (programs selected for deletion) are somehow unnecessary data". The examiner

Art Unit: 2623

respectfully disagrees with applicant's rationale. Since Browne teaches the step of activating a preference to delete a program selected by the user for deletion, Browne teaches that the user can delete any program that the user desires. In doing so, the user has clearly indicated what is undesirable to the user, and therefore unnecessary. Similarly, Liebenow teaches the step of recording duplicates when a higher quality is desirable over an existing lower quality. The very act of recording a program identified as a duplicate indicates that the higher quality would be desirable over the lower quality of the program, i.e. the lower quality of the program is less desirable over the higher quality program. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine features of the two systems in order to enable the user to delete undesirable data.

For the reasons stated above, the finality of the rejection is deemed proper and thus maintained.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Usha Raman whose telephone number is (571) 272-7380. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

UR



CHRIS KELLEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600